



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,595	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6609	4259
5073	7590	11/19/2007		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER LEWIS, ALICIA M	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,595

Applicant(s)

HARVEY ET AL.

Examiner

Alicia M. Lewis

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination filed September 7, 2007. Claims 17-20 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support in the specification for the following limitations added to claims 1 and 8: "**in response to receiving the user request, determining a domain name associated with the entry and a domain name associated with the user; allowing the user to access the entry if the domain name associated with the entry is the same as the domain associated with the user; and not allowing the user to access the entry if the domain name associated with the entry is not the same as the domain name associated with the user.**" The specification mentions enforcing access controls by only allowing a user access to the sub-tree under the user's account entry (paragraph 350 of the US-PBPUB

2004/0215621); however there is no description or mention of determining domain names or comparing domain names to either deny or allow access to a user. As such, the recited limitations above represent new matter.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claims 18 and 20 recite, in part, "logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers." It is unclear as to what the term "entry" is referring.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-7, 15, 17 and 18 are directed to a method for use in a web services arrangement. This claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomenon) since it fails to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Art Unit: 2164

Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a tangible result because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulated data. More specifically, the claimed subject matter provides for either allowing access or not allowing access to an entry. Both produced results remain in the abstract and, thus fail to achieve the required status of having real world value.

Claims 8-14, 116, 19 and 20 are directed to a computer readable medium including code for use in a web services arrangement. This claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomenon) since it fails to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a tangible result because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulated data. More specifically, the claimed subject matter provides for either allowing access or not allowing access to an entry. Both produced results remain in the abstract and, thus fail to achieve the required status of having real world value.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1) in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois').

With respect to claims 1 and 8, Elmore teaches:

arranging user object(s) under a repository layer comprising one or more repository objects collectively forming a prefix, each user object representing a web services account (elements 462 and 463 in Figure 19, paragraph 626; and element 491 and 492 in Figure 21, paragraph 976-978);

arranging business entity object(s) under user object(s) (elements 467 and 468 in Figure 19, paragraph 626; and element 493 in Figure 21, paragraph 976); and

receiving a user request for an entry (Figure 9, paragraphs 194 and 195).

Elmore does not teach arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix.

Gadbois teaches information model mapping with shared directory tree representations (see abstract), in which he teaches arranging corresponding tModel

Art Unit: 2164

object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix (paragraph 39).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Elmore by the teaching of Gadbois because arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix would enable an efficient means of recording and publishing assertions regarding business organization relationships (peer-to-peer, parent-subsidary, etc.) by different business organizations or their authorized publishing entities and an efficient means of managing publisher assertions (Gadbois, paragraph 4).

With respect to claims 2 and 9, Elmore as modified teaches arranging publisher assertion object(s) under business entity object(s) (Gadbois, elements 222, 224, 252, 254, 282 and 284 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28-29).

With respect to claims 3 and 10, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising providing service projection object(s) under business entity object(s) (Gadbois, elements 222, 224, 242, 243, 244, 272 and 274 in Figure 2, paragraph 28).

With respect to claims 4 and 11, Elmore as modified teaches wherein the service projection object(s) is implemented as an alias (Gadbois, elements 242, 243, 244, 245 and 246 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28 and 29).

With respect to claims 5 and 12, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising first field(s) as attributes of publisher assertion object(s) (Gadbois, elements 254 and 284 in Figure 2, paragraph 33).

Gadbois teaches that publisher assertion names (PublisherAssertion1 and PublisherAssertion2) and publisher names (Publisher1 and Publisher2) are attributes of publisher assertion object(s).

With respect to claims 6 and 13, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising representing a keyed reference by an auxiliary class (Gadbois, paragraphs 38-39).

Gadbois discloses that a fromKey, toKey, and keyedReference are all included when publisher assertions are added to a directory information tree (DIT). One having ordinary skill in the art recognizes that these included attributes represent an auxiliary class because they are added to publisher assertion objects instances rather than to the entire class of objects.

With respect to claims 7 and 14, Elmore as modified teaches further comprising providing a distinguished name of an object revealing a chain of ownership and control for the object (Gadbois, Figure 2, paragraphs 27-29).

With respect to claims 15 and 16, Elmore as modified teaches storing the arrangement of user objects, one or more repository objects, business entity objects,

and tmodel objects in a registry accessible to one or more users of web services (Gadbois, paragraphs 23-25).

With respect to claims 17 and 19, Elmore as modified teaches:

providing a plurality of repository layers distributed on a plurality of servers, each repository layer comprising at least one repository object (Elmore, paragraphs 46 and 978); and

assigning a domain name to each of the plurality of repository layers (Elmore, paragraphs 972 and 973); and

wherein arranging user object(s) under a repository layer comprises arranging user object(s) under each of the repository objects (Elmore, paragraph 978).

9. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1) in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois') as applied to claims 1-17 and 19 above, and further in view of Grubbs et al. (US 2003/0236956 A1) ('Grubbs').

With respect to claims 18 and 20, Elmore as modified teaches:

providing a plurality of repository layers distributed on a plurality of servers, each repository layer comprising at least one repository object (Elmore, paragraph 46).

Elmore as modified does not teach logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers.

Art Unit: 2164

Grubbs teaches file system backup in a logical volume management data storage environment (see abstract), in which he teaches logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers (paragraphs 24-26).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Elmore by the teaching of Grubbs because logically representing each entry on each server, each entry only stored on a selected one of the plurality of servers would enable capturing a valid point-in-time image of a system using logical volume management, which could further be used for archiving and back-ups (Grubbs, abstract).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alicia Lewis
November 9, 2007



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER